<u>In the claims</u>:

Please amend the claims as shown immediately below with all changes (<u>e.g.</u>, additions, deletions, modifications) included, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c)(1)(i).

Claims

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented process for searching among a collection of documents, the collection comprising a referencing document and a referenced document referenced in the referencing document, the process comprising:

aggregating the referencing document and the referenced document referenced in the referencing document to form an aggregate document, <u>whereby said aggregate document is associated with content capable of being indexed, said content coming from the referenced document and from the referencing document</u>;

indexing the aggregate document, based on index terms contained in the referencing and in the referenced documents forming the aggregate document, to form an aggregate document index;

searching by operating on said aggregate document index; and

returning, as a result of the searching step, a located aggregate document.

Claims 2–3 (previously cancelled).

Claims 4–7 (previously cancelled).

8. (Currently Amended) A search engine for searching among a collection of documents, the collection comprising a referencing document and a referenced document referenced in the referencing document, the search engine comprising an inverted index table of aggregate documents, wherein an entry in the index table is associated to an aggregate document aggregating the referencing document and the referenced document, <u>whereby said aggregate</u>

document is associated with content capable of being indexed, said content coming from the referenced document and from the referencing document.

9. (previously amended) The search engine of claim 8, further comprising;

a display routine adapted to display, for a result comprising a the referencing document or the referenced document;

content of the referencing document; and

information or attribute of the referenced document.

10. (Previously Amended) The computer-implemented process of claim 1, further comprising the step of displaying an aggregate document with

a content of the referencing document; and

information or attribute of the referenced document.

11. (Previously Amended) The computer-implemented process of claim 1, wherein the collection comprises a referencing document and at least two referenced documents in the referencing document, and wherein the process further comprises a step of selecting a subset of the referenced documents.

12. (Previously Amended) The computer-implemented process of claim 1, wherein the collection comprises a referencing document and at least two referenced documents referenced in the referencing document, and wherein the process further comprises a step of sorting referenced documents.

13. (Previously Entered) The computer-implemented process of claim 10, wherein the information or attribute comprise a link to the referenced document.

14. (Previously Entered) The computer-implemented process of claim 10 wherein the process comprises, for a result, the display of

content of the referencing document;

information or attribute of a first document referenced in the referencing document; and

information or attribute of a second document referenced in the referencing document.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in light of the present Amendment and Remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 8–14 are currently pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claims 1 and Claim 8 are amended to make clear that the aggregate document in accordance with the subject matter claimed herein is not merely a graphical snapshot of a fully rendered web page, but instead is an aggregate document associated with content capable of being indexed, with the content drawn from the referenced document and the referencing document. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment further clarifies a significant difference between subject matter the applicant regards as his invention and Snyder.

Finality of the Rejection

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the decision to make the previous action final. Applicant respectfully submits that the previous amendment was done to seek to define applicant's invention in claims that will provide the scope of protection to which applicant is entitled, and not for purposes of delay. MPEP § 7.06 explains: "The applicant who is seeking to define his or her invention in claims that will give him or her the patent protection to which he or she is justly entitled should receive the cooperation of the examiner to that end, and not be prematurely cut off in the prosecution of his or her application." In particular, the previous amendment clarified the claims, in part by eliminating problems with antecedent basis.